



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/964,307	09/26/2001	James T. Bodner	200302220-1	9916
22879	7590	07/09/2010	EXAMINER	
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY			AILES, BENJAMIN A	
Intellectual Property Administration			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3404 E. Harmony Road				2442
Mail Stop 35				
FORT COLLINS, CO 80528				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/09/2010		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
ipa.mail@hp.com
laura.m.clark@hp.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte JAMES T. BODNER and ANDREW BROWN

Appeal 2009-006019
Application 09/964,307
Technology Center 2400

Before JOSEPH F. RUGGIERO, MAHSHID D. SAADAT, and
CARLA M. KRIVAK, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

KRIVAK, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL¹

Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from a final rejection of claims 1, 5-7, 11-14, and 18-20. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We affirm.

¹ The two-month time period for filing an appeal or commencing a civil action, as recited in 37 C.F.R. § 1.304, or for filing a request for rehearing, as recited in 37 C.F.R. § 41.52, begins to run from the “MAIL DATE” (paper delivery mode) or the “NOTIFICATION DATE” (electronic delivery mode) shown on the PTOL-90A cover letter attached to this decision.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellants' claimed invention is a system and method for automatically configuring a plurality of server computers (Spec. ¶ [0003]).

Independent claim 1, reproduced below, is representative of the subject matter on appeal.

1. An automatic method of configuring a server in a system including a plurality of servers, comprising:
 - (a) requesting configuration data by the server to be configured;
 - (b) without human intervention, identifying from among a plurality of servers, which server includes configuration data suitable for use by the server to be configured, wherein each of the plurality of servers has configuration data that can be used to configure another server;
 - (c) automatically retrieving the suitable configuration data from said identified server; and
 - (d) providing the retrieved configuration data to the server to be configured.

REFERENCES

Suorsa	US 2004/0226010 A1	Nov. 11, 2004
Baker	US 7,080,138 B1	Jul. 18, 2006

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 5-7, 11-14, and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based upon the teachings of Suorsa and Baker.

Appellants contend Suorsa and Baker cannot be combined because Suorsa is directed to a centralized configuration system and Baker is directed

to a decentralized system (distributed system), and thus, are mutually exclusive (App. Br. 10-11).²

ANALYSIS

Appellants argue Suorsa and Baker cannot be combined because they teach centralized and decentralized networks, respectively, which are mutually exclusive (App. Br. 11). Appellants argue Baker teaches how to “select a content server to provide desired content to a client when the desired content is already present on multiple content servers” but in Suorsa “the desired configuration data is only present at one location” (App. Br. 11). Thus, a resulting system due to the combination would have “multiple copies of Suorsa’s configuration database stored at various locations in the network,” resulting in an overly complex system (App. Br. 12).

The Examiner asserts Baker was cited for providing a method for configuration data delivery (Ans. 9; col., 2, ll. 26-29) to a requesting server as taught by Suorsa (Ans. 9; ¶ [0048]). Further, as the Examiner noted, the claims do not require a centralized system or a decentralized system.

In light of the Examiner’s findings (Ans. 3-4, 9), which we adopt as our own, claim 1 and claims 7 and 14 argued therewith (App. Br. 12) are obvious over the combination of Suorsa and Baker. The remaining claims, not separately argued (App. Br. 12) fall with claims 1, 7, and 14.

² The Supplemental Appeal Brief mailed January 11, 2008, is referenced throughout this opinion.

CONCLUSION

The Examiner did not err in rejecting claims 1, 5-7, 11-14, and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

DECISION

The Examiner's decision rejecting claims 1, 5-7, 11-14, and 18-20 is affirmed.

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv).

AFFIRMED

KIS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
3404 E. Harmony Road
Mail Stop 35
FORT COLLINS, CO 80528